

Message

---

**From:** Kenneth Portier [kenneth.portier@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** 8/6/2020 2:40:37 PM  
**To:** Wong, Diana [Wong.Diana-M@epa.gov]  
**Subject:** Re: Concurrence for Asbestos Report  
**Attachments:** SACC Asbestos CoverPage KP\_Signed.pdf; SACC Asbestos Report Final 08062020.docx

Diana,

We have not sought concurrence with previous reviews. The current draft is not dramatically changed from the draft sent out for review. Here are the major differences which are mostly superficial:

1. Recommendations are numbered. I revised some from a passive voice ("Suggest that EPA...", "EPA consider...") to an active statement ("Discuss and justify ...", "Provide more..."). This is the way our recommendations have been stated in all 9 of the previous reviews. The assumption is that EPA will address each recommendation and inform the Committee and the public, which they plan to do and which not. A list of Recommendations added to the end of the document.
2. Figures have numbered captions and a list of Figures included.
3. Added some references, primarily for government reports that were referenced in the text but not listed in the report. In some cases, I removed the title of the report from the body of the report and used the citation (e.g. U.S.EPA, 2012) only. Tightened up the text.,
4. One recommendation and associated text was removed from, I think, Question 6.1 since it duplicated word-for-word text and recommendation from Question 4.
5. In a couple of places I added a numbered recommendation when the text indicated it was the intent of the Committee to make a recommendation (e.g. the text said "The Committee recommended...").
6. In a couple of places I split a long recommendation into two. It is a common occurrence with our format that Question leads provide these multi-part recommendations that need splitting.
7. The original text provided by EPA as preface to some questions has been italicized to ensure it is different from the Committee's response.
8. Added dashes at the end of each question's comment text to identify the end of the discussion.
9. I replaced the copied "table" in Appendix A with a snapshot of the same material. Makes it easier to read.
10. Each Editorial Comment is prefaced by the page or pages to which it refers. I removed one duplicate editorial comment. Revised some of the others by adding in context to make the requested change clearer. On one comment I had to guess what was being recommended but I feel confident that I have it correct.

None of this changes the major wording or the intent of the Committee's voice on the subject of the TSCA Asbestos report.

I recommend we finish the report and send it to Steven and Hayley for their review. Sometimes, if given time, Steven provides good edits that need addressing.

Attached is the final version with that last footnote included. Once you review and make your changes, I will assume you will communicate the report to Steve and Hayley. I have also attached a signed but undated cover sheet.

Ken Portier.

On Thu, Aug 6, 2020 at 9:35 AM Wong, Diana <Wong.Diana-M@epa.gov> wrote:

Hello Ken,

Are we seeking concurrence from Committee members for the draft that I sent on August 2?

I have not heard from at least half of the panel members. If we are seeking concurrence on that draft, I have to ask them to send us an email that they concur, even though they have no comment, or that we assume they concur since they have not submitted comments.

I have not yet reviewed the draft you sent. I do not know if they are just minor editorial changes, or do we need to send out again the latest draft. What do you think? Thanks.

Diana